



Robert Greene Sterne  
Edward J. Kessler  
Jorge A. Goldstein  
David K.S. Cornwell  
Robert W. Esmond  
Tracy-Gene G. Durkin  
Michele A. Cimbala  
Michael B. Ray  
Robert E. Sokohl  
Eric K. Steffe  
Michael Q. Lee  
Steven R. Ludwig  
John M. Covert  
Linda E. Alcorn  
Robert C. Millonig  
Lawrence B. Bugaisky  
Donald J. Featherstone  
Michael V. Messinger

Judith U. Kim  
Timothy J. Shea, Jr.  
Patrick E. Garrett  
Jeffery T. Helvey\*  
Heidi L. Kraus  
Crystal D. Sayles  
Edward W. Yee  
Albert L. Ferro\*  
Donald R. Banowitz  
Peter A. Jackman  
Molly A. McCall  
Teresa U. Medler  
Jeffrey S. Weaver  
Kendrick P. Patterson  
Vincent L. Capuano  
Albert J. Fasulo II\*  
Eldora Ellison Floyd  
W. Russell Swindell

Thomas C. Fiala  
Brian J. Del Buono  
Virgil Lee Beaton\*  
Reginald D. Lucas\*  
Kimberly N. Reddick  
Theodore A. Wood  
Elizabeth J. Haanes  
Bruce E. Chalker  
Joseph S. Ostroff  
Frank R. Cottingham\*  
Christine M. Lhulier  
Rae Lynn Prengaman\*  
Jane Shershenovich\*  
Lawrence J. Carroll\*  
George S. Bardmesser

**Registered Patent Agents\***  
Karen R. Markowicz  
Andrea J. Kamage  
Nancy J. Leith  
Joseph M. Conrad III  
Ann E. Summerfield  
Helene C. Carlson  
Gaby L. Longworth  
Matthew J. Dowd  
Aaron L. Schwartz  
Angelique G. Uy  
Boris A. Matvenko  
Mary B. Tung  
Katrina Y. Pei  
Bryan L. Skelton  
Jason D. Eisenberg  
John J. Figueroa

**Senior Counsel**  
Samuel L. Fox  
Kenneth C. Bass III  
Lisa A. Dunner

\* Admitted only in Maryland  
\* Admitted only in Virginia  
\* Admitted only in Texas  
• Practice Limited to  
Federal Agencies

July 31, 2002

**WRITER'S DIRECT NUMBER:**

(202) 371-2673

**INTERNET ADDRESS:**

JCOVERT@SKGF.COM

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**Group Art Unit 1626**

Re: U.S. Patent Application  
Appl. No. 09/814,123; Filed: March 22, 2001  
For: **Aryl Substituted Pyrazoles, Triazoles and Tetrazoles, and the Use  
Thereof**  
Inventors: Hogenkamp *et al.*  
Our Ref: 1861.1270001/JMC/THN

Sir:

Transmitted herewith for appropriate action are the following documents:

1. Reply to Restriction and Election of Species Requirements; and
2. One (1) return postcard.

It is respectfully requested that the attached postcard be stamped with the date of filing of these documents, and that it be returned to our courier. In the event that extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this patent application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned.

Commissioner for Patents

July 31, 2002

Page 2

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-0036.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John M. Covert". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of the first and last names being capitalized and prominent.

John M. Covert  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 38,759

Enclosures

SKGF\_DC1:40245.1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Hogenkamp *et al.*

Appl. No.: 09/814,123

Filed: March 22, 2001

For: **Aryl Substituted Pyrazoles, Triazoles  
and Tetrazoles, and the Use Thereof**

Confirmation No. 2060

Art Unit: 1626

Examiner: Shameem, G.

Atty. Docket: 1861.1270001/JMC/THN

**Reply To Restriction and Election of Species Requirements**

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In reply to the Office Action dated July 1, 2002 (PTO File Wrapper Paper No. 9),  
Applicants submit the following Remarks.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 19-0036.

***Remarks***

The Examiner has required restriction to one of six groups of inventions, Groups **I-VI**, under 35 U.S.C. § 121. Group **I**, represented by claims 1-14 and 17, is drawn to a compound and composition of Formula *I*. Group **II**, represented by claims 1, 15-17 and 24, is drawn to a compound and composition of Formula *I*. Group **III**, represented by claims 18-21 and 27, is drawn to a method of treating a disorder. Group **IV**, represented by claims 22-23, is drawn to a compound of Formula *I*. Group **V**, represented by claim 25, is drawn to a compound of Formula *I*. Group **VI**, represented by claim 26, is drawn to a compound of Formula *I*. The Examiner has also requested an election of a single disclosed species under 35 C.F.R. § 121.

Applicants hereby provisionally elect to prosecute the invention of Group **I** (claims 1-14 and 17) which is drawn to compounds of Formula *I*. This election is made without prejudice to or disclaimer of the other claims or inventions disclosed.

In addition, Applicants provisionally elect the species 1-(4-phenoxyphenyl)-1H-pyrazole-3-carboxamide, prepared in Example 2, at paragraphs [0128] and [0129] of the specification as originally filed. Claims 1-11 and 15-25 read on this species.

Both elections are made **with** traverse.

M.P.E.P. § 803 (Eighth Edition, August 2001), at page 800-4, left hand column, states as one of the criteria for a proper requirement for restriction that: "There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required ...". Thus, the Patent Office encourages the search and examination of an entire application on the merits, where such

search and examination can be made *without* serious burden. Further, different classification or separate commercial data base and automated patent system (text) searches are not a proper standard for restriction requirement.

In the present case, Applicants respectfully assert that the search of restriction Groups I-VI does not impose a serious burden upon the Examiner, as a search concerning the patentability of the invention of one group will clearly uncover art of interest to the other groups. At least, the search of restriction Groups I, II, and IV does not impose a serious burden to the Examiner, since the invention of Group I is generic to inventions of Groups II and IV. Search required for Groups II and IV is required for Group I. Further, Applicants submit that the search of Group I and Group VI in part, as far Group VI includes compounds of Group I that are  $^3\text{H}$  or  $^{14}\text{C}$  radiolabeled, would not present an undue burden to the U.S.P.T.O.

Further, restriction practice is not applicable to a single claim. See *In re Weber*, 198 U.S.P.Q. 332 (C.C.P.A. 1978) and its companion case, *In re Haas*, 198 U.S.P.Q. 334 (C.C.P.A. 1978). These cases make it clear that 35 U.S.C. § 121 does not grant to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) the authority to refuse to examine a single claimed invention. Section 121 only applies to *plural* claimed inventions in *different* claims, wherein the different claims vary not just in scope, but in the invention to which each is directed.

Thus, Applicants submit that in the present case, restriction to one of six groups of inventions, as required by the Examiner, is improper. Therefore, the claims of Groups I-VI should be examined together. Applicants respectfully request that at least the claims of

Groups I, II, IV, and VI (in part as far Group VI includes compounds of Group I that are  $^3\text{H}$  or  $^{14}\text{C}$  radiolabeled) be examined together.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement, and consideration and allowance of all pending claims, are respectfully requested

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



John M. Covert  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 38,759

Date: July 31, 2002

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

**Applicants:** Hogenkamp *et al.*

**Application No.:** 09/814,123

**Filed:** March 22, 2001

**For:** Aryl Substituted Pyrazoles, Triazoles and Tetrazoles, and the Use Thereof

**Due Date:** August 1, 2002

**Art Unit:** 1626

**Examiner:** Shameem, G.

**Docket:** 1861.1270001

**Atty:** JMC/THN

When receipt stamp is placed hereon, the USPTO acknowledges receipt of the following documents:

1. SKGF Cover Letter;

**Applicants:** Hogenkamp *et al.*

**Application No.:** 09/814,123

**Filed:** March 22, 2001

**For:** Aryl Substituted Pyrazoles, Triazoles and Tetrazoles, and the Use Thereof

**Due Date:** August 1, 2002

**Art Unit:** 1626

**Examiner:** Shameem, G.

**Docket:** 1861.1270001

**Atty:** JMC/THN

When receipt stamp is placed hereon, the USPTO acknowledges receipt of the following documents:

1. SKGF Cover Letter;
2. Reply to Restriction and Election of Species Requirements; and
3. One (1) return postcard.



July 31, 2002

**Please Date Stamp And Return To Our Courier**